



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION**

CORVIN J. YOUNG,	§
Plaintiff,	§
	§
vs.	§ Civil Action No. 6:23-02378-MGL
	§
SPARTANBURG COUNTY DETENTION	§
CENTER, SPARTANBURG COUNTY,	§
CHUCK WRIGHT, <i>County Sheriff</i> ,	§
KATHERINE M. SIEBER ESQ., <i>Spartanburg</i>	§
<i>County Public Defender</i> , MOLLY H. CHERRY, §	§
<i>Federal Magistrate Court Judge</i> , and DEPUTY §	§
MEDVEDEV, <i>Spartanburg County Sheriff's</i>	§
<i>Office</i> ,	§
Defendants.	§

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
AND DISMISSING ACTION WITH PREJUDICE,
WITHOUT FURTHER LEAVE TO AMEND,
AND WITHOUT ISSUANCE AND SERVICE OF PROCESS**

Plaintiff Corvin J. Young (Young) filed this civil rights action against the above-named Defendants.

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge recommending the Court dismiss this action with prejudice, without further leave to amend and without issuance and service of process. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the

Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on August 14, 2023. To date, Young has failed to file any objections.

“[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845–46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case under the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court this action is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**, without further leave to amend, and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 20th day of September 2023, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis
 MARY GEIGER LEWIS
 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within sixty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.